Remarks

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 3-13 and 20-22 have been amended. Claims 1, 2, 14-19, 23 and 24 have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 3-13 and 20-22 are presented for examination.

Claims 1 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Skazinksi et al. (U.S Patent No. 6,574,709). Applicants submit that this rejection has been obviated by the cancellation of claim 1 and the amendment of claim 12.

Claims 1, 3-5, 8 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Loechel (U.S. Patent No. 5,895,485). In addition, claims 2, 13, 17-18 and 19-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Loechel. Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Loechel.

Loechel discloses a method for mirroring cache data from a first controller to an alternate controller in a data storage system, where the data storage system includes a host computer connected to the first controller and the alternate controller. According to the method, the first controller receives a write data request from a host computer that includes data to be written by the first controller to a system drive. The first controller caches the data into a first memory. Next, the first controller mirrors the data to the alternate controller, such that the alternate controller copies the data into a second memory. The data in the first memory is linked to the data in the second memory, which enables a controller performing a cache data mirror operation to not have to ask an alternate controller for a location, in the alternate controller's memory, to transfer the data into. The multiple cache data mirror operations to a particular cache line, are coalesced into a single cache data mirror operation. See Loechel at col. 3, ll. 5-50.

Claim 3 of the present application recites determining if data within duplicate cache line is corrupt and writing the data to a first location in memory if the duplicate cache line is not corrupt. Applicant submits that nowhere in Loechel is there disclosed or suggested a

process of determining if data within duplicate cache line is corrupt, or writing the data to a first location in memory if the duplicate cache line is not corrupt. Therefore, claim 3 is patentable over Loechel.

Claims 4-7 and 12 depend from claim 3 and include additional features. Thus, claims 4-7 and 12 are also patentable over Loechel.

Claim 8 recites determining if data within duplicate cache line is corrupt and writing the data to a first location in memory if the duplicate cache line is not corrupt. For the reasons described above with respect to claim 3, claim 8 is also patentable over Loechel. Because claims 9-11 and 13 depend from claim 8 and include additional features, claims 9-11 and 13 are also patentable over Loechel.

Claim 20 recites a cache controller to write data to a first location in a main memory device if the duplicate cache line is not corrupt. Thus, for the reasons described above with respect to claim 3, claim 20 is also patentable over Loechel. Since claims 21 and 22 depend from claim 20 and include additional features, claims 20 and 22 are also patentable over Loechel.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: August 20, 2004

Mark L. Watson
Reg. No. 46,322

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(303) 740-1980